



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Bible Series, published by Macmillan, and arranged and edited by the same author. In this series the following, composing the Wisdom series, have already appeared: "The Proverbs;" "Ecclesiasticus;" "Ecclesiastes—Wisdom of Solomon;" and the "Book of Job." Each is provided with a special introduction, table of contents, prologues, epilogues, annotations, etc.,—everything in the style of a modern book. Their handy form, the elegance and taste displayed by both editor and publisher make them unusually attractive volumes.

THOMAS J. McCORMACK.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. 1765-1865. By *Edward Channing, Ph. D.*, Assistant Professor of History in Harvard University. Cambridge [England]: University Press. 1896. [Cambridge Historical Series.]

So much has been said of the extent to which present relations between America and England are affected by instructions given in school concerning their old disputes and conflicts, that opportuneness will be at once conceded to the present volume. It is written especially for English readers, and comes with every guarantee of competency and fairness, as well as with the promise of enabling Englishmen to review, from the American standpoint, a century in which the histories of the two nations can hardly at any point be disconnected. The century is happily chosen. The first chapter, of forty pages, is a condensed and valuable prologue in which the colonial conditions and events which prepared the arena and led on to the struggles for nationality, are presented in broad outlines. Between the spring of 1765, when the Stamp-Act was imposed by Parliament, and the spring of 1865, when the restored Union was cemented by the blood of President Lincoln, lies the continuous history of American nationality, and Dr. Channing has shown good workmanship in compressing this century of events in the space of three hundred pages. Of course in that space, determined, no doubt, by editorial exigencies, some salient matters are necessarily omitted; but some suppressions are questionable. The proceedings of Governors Tryon in North Carolina and Dunmore in Virginia in fanning popular rage might at least have been referred to, though less striking than the case of Hutchinson in Massachusetts who was the first to put "independence" into the New England head. In trying to suppress the Tea troubles, he "rashly began an academic discussion as to the rights and duties of the colonists, proving conclusively that the position assumed by the colonists was unsound and that they must either submit or become independent." Dr. Channing regards the Stamp Act as constitutional but inexpedient. He is perhaps a little too tender in passing over the arrogant attitude of the English government towards American petitions, and the gratuitous ungraciousness which accompanied the repeal of the Stamp Act with a Declaratory Act affirming the right "to bind the colonies and people of America, subjects of the crown of Great Britain, in all cases whatsoever." Lord North told George III. that it was this Act, mere waste paper, which hurt the Americans most.

As a rule Dr. Channing avoids more than could be wished the sore points in his story for English readers, but in one instance we find a curious example of the permanence of unhistoric traditions even in seats of learning. Thus, in writing of the surrender of Burgoyne (page 92), he says :

"The Saratoga Convention stipulated that British soldiers should embark on transports to be provided by their government, and should not serve again in North America until exchanged. Weakness or good nature had induced Gates to grant these terms. The convention was not carried out in good faith by either party to it. The public property was not again given up by the British, and a demand for a descriptive list of the prisoners drew from Burgoyne some ill-advised words to the effect that the Convention had been broken by the Americans. These things, trifling in themselves, may be held, in some slight degree, to justify the Continental Congress in its refusal to ratify the Convention. The real reason, however, for that action seems to have been a natural fear on the part of the French government lest the Convention troops should be used against them in Europe. On moral grounds this action of Congress cannot be defended, but legally it was justifiable."

Documents cited in Fonblanque's *Life of Burgoyne* show that Gates's terms were the alternative of a life-and-death struggle; that there was not the slightest departure from good faith on the British side; and the justice of Burgoyne's "ill-advised words" is now justified by an authority which relieves the French of all participation in the matter. This authority is no less than that of Washington himself who, in a letter to the President of Congress (November 26, 1777), reminds him that so soon as the surrendered troops reach England, "the most scrupulous and virtuous observance of the convention will justify the ministry in placing them in garrison, and sending out others to reinforce General Howe." This letter will be found in Ford's "Writings of Washington," Vol. VI., page 225, and in the same volume, pages 245-248, 283, 293, 369, may be found further letters and notes of the means by which fulfilment of the convention was avoided.

Dr. Channing is generally careful in his treatment of international points, of later periods, so far as England is concerned, though, he occasionally makes questionable remarks. Thus, with regard to the Ashburton treaty it is said (p. 227): "It appears, however, that had Webster been correctly informed, he need not have yielded as much as he did as to the north-eastern boundary of Maine." The Secretary of State (Webster) had in his desk the red-lined map used by Franklin at the treaty of 1783, which coincided with the boundary claimed by England, and it is doubtful whether he would have got so much had this evidence been known to Lord Ashburton. (*Parl. Debates*, LXVII, 183.)

The sixty-six pages allotted to the late Civil War are written with fairness to the South, but not always with due recognition of the small wires on which hung great weights, "The 'Horror of Fredericksburg'" (December 13, 1862), says Dr. Channing, "cost the Union army thirteen thousand men," but it might have been

added that the whole army might have been destroyed but for Lee's reluctance to shell the beloved little town, a tenderness which permitted Burnside's army to cross the Rappahannock on pontoons during the night. "The people of the western part of Virginia," says our author, "had no sympathy with secession. They were outvoted in the State Convention by the delegates from the eastern part of the State." But a majority of the eastern delegates were also opposed to secession, and the Virginia Convention was carried for secession solely by President Lincoln's proclamation of April 15, 1861, calling upon the States, Virginia included, for seventy-five thousand militiamen to march against the seven States which had seceded. That demand on the Virginians to march against their Southern brethren came while the State Convention was in session, and turned the Unionist majority into a minority. Had the President's proclamation been delayed a day or two, at most, Virginia would have adhered to the Union, for another Convention was impossible. It is doubtful whether without Virginia the Confederacy could have made much headway, and it is certain that our historian would not have had to record the startling figures that the war, in its two thousand four hundred actions, cost the whole country a million lives, and two thousand million pounds sterling. This may appear a moderate cost for what Dr. Channing regards as the result—settlement of the "two questions of slavery and nationality"; but as he declares the interpretation of the Constitution, as to the right of secession, as "historically uncertain," it seems strange that among the constitutional amendments that have grown out of the war none should affirm the inviolability of the Union.

Dr. Channing's little book is so well written, and in some matters so instructive, that with some revision and amendment in the light of historic justice, it might serve for educational uses. Unfortunately the Professor does not escape from the ruts worn by some of his predecessors, even though their traditional errors have been revealed by recent investigators. Prejudice is apt to be tyrannous in proportion to the importance of the things involved; and in American history especially the most vital questions are connected with certain eminent men on whom the historian's judgment cannot be pronounced uncritically without misleading his readers in matters more important than any individual. A Harvard professor—shall we say a Channing?—might be expected to speak with discrimination even of Tom Paine; but if that were too much to ask, surely he should not write of any historic figure in the following way: "Charles Lee, a renegade Englishman, committed treason many times; and of Horatio Gates, a recent immigrant to Virginia, it is difficult to speak with calmness. He was self-sufficient and cowardly; and he treated his subordinates with a spirit of unfairness and jealousy hardly to be conceived." If Dr. Channing possesses fresh information concerning these men, it should have been here adduced; so far as the facts have been published, it is left doubtful whether Lee was ever disloyal at heart to the American cause, and the charge of cowardice against Gates has never been proved. He did not anticipate his victory at Saratoga, and had prudently prepared means for retreat if necessary,

but we cannot think much would ever have been heard of this, or of Charles Lee's "treason," if the two men had not been accused of slighting Washington. Of Washington Dr. Channing says: "As a man, and as a leader of men, George Washington occupies an unique position among historic personages of ancient and modern times. Other men have been more brilliant than he; but in no other man have considerable abilities been combined with absolute honesty and steadfastness of purpose as they were in him." With such a view of the chieftain it must require exceptional self-restraint not to offer up promptly on his altar any one on whom he frowned, and our author's failures to exercise this self-restraint mar his history at several important points. Thus, he says of the Minister of the French Republic (1793):

"Landing at Charleston, Genet at once began the fitting out of privateers, and seemed disposed to use the soil of the United States as if it were French territory. Jefferson advised him to be moderate in his actions; but Genet not only broke promises he had made to the Secretary of State, but he defied the Government. Washington, after mature deliberation, decided to regard the treaty of 1778 as not binding in this case. . . . Genet then appealed to the people against Washington" (p. 148).

Whether Genet broke any promises to the Secretary of State (Jefferson), or the latter broke his promises to Genet, is a question of veracity between the two men, and as our author describes Jefferson as "a political inventor," and "working in the dark," it would seem that the notoriously frank and undiplomatic Genet might fairly claim his verdict. But as to the alleged appeal of Genet to the people against Washington, it was not charged at the time, but only that he had been heard to threaten that he would do so. This charge was made by John Jay and Rufus King, who were compelled to name Mr. Dallas as the man who heard the threat, and this drew from Dallas a complete denial of their story. The documents were all printed in the *American Historical Register*, November 1866.

Edmund Randolph, on whom the crisis of Washington's presidential career turned, is not even mentioned in Dr. Channing's book!

Another man unfortunate enough to fall under Washington's disapprobation was Monroe, who was the United States Minister in Paris during the excitement there over the British Treaty of 1795. "Instead," says Dr. Channing, "of trying to reconcile the French government to Jay's treaty, he increased the irritation which was felt in France by his petulant and undignified conduct, and returned to the United States in disgrace." On the contrary, Monroe, despite his dislike of the Treaty, had almost brought the French government to tolerate it, and it was his sudden recall that undid his work and brought France and the United States to the verge of war. So far from returning to America in disgrace, Monroe returned to become President of the United States, and our author himself is constrained to say, "Monroe's first administration was in many respects the most successful in

the history of the country," and that "the close of Monroe's (second) administration was in every respect the end of the "Era of Good Feeling."

These lapses are not numerous in Dr. Channing's book, but they are sadly significant. They could not have been made by any writer who had mastered even the published documents recently brought to light concerning Washington, Monroe, Edmund Randolph, Jefferson, Thomas Paine, much less searched into the mass of unpublished documents in our State archives. It is distressing to observe a similar lack of original research in most of the volumes which profess to deal in any compendious way with American history. McMasters, John Fiske, and now Dr. Channing, seem to think that our history can be written within the walls of their respective libraries, and do not appear to be aware that they are dealing summarily with facts, traditions, situations, affecting other countries, and even with the international relations of these countries at the present moment. A similar fault pervades most of the historical works of England and France, which are largely indictments of each other, based on partial investigations. There is great need of a real and thorough work, written by some English or American scholar, narrating with absolute impartiality the international history of America, England, and France, and without any bias of national pride in great names,—such as Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Hamilton, Burke, Pitt, Fox, Napoleon, or any other conventionalised hero or bogey. These men had their virtues and their faults, and by both history was moulded; and the historian, occupying the House of the Interpreter, should never descend into the arena of the partisan conflicts whose meaning he is to unfold and whose results he is to trace out.

What young and brave student is there in the West who will consecrate himself to the task of giving to America and to Europe a history that exact thinkers and judicial patriots in both hemispheres shall welcome, and which may train the more cosmopolitan generation whose motto will be: "The world is my country, to do good my religion"?

M. D. CONWAY.

GRUNDRISSE DER PSYCHOLOGIE. By *Wilhelm Wundt*. Leipsic: Wilhelm Engelmann. 1896, Pages, 392.

The psychological views of Professor Wundt are so well known, and his works on this and cognate branches so widely circulated, that it is unnecessary to speak of the character and tendency of his present concise *Rudiments of Psychology*, which after long solicitations he has at last been induced to give to the world. It will be sufficient to characterise its position with regard to the great psychologist's other works. The purpose of the *Rudiments* has been a twofold one: first, to place into the hands of Professor Wundt's pupils an outline of his oral course in psychology, an end which will meet the needs of nearly all students of the subject, and secondly, to provide for the general reader of culture, who wishes to get some conception of the work in modern psychology, a systematic survey of its most important results and theories. In consequence of this simplicity and limitation of pur-